

# SPEECH

OF

MR. NILES, OF CONNECTICUT,

ON

THE TARIFF.

DELIVERED

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MONDAY, JULY 20, 1846.

---

WASHINGTON :

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF BLAIR AND RIVES.

1846.

## THE TARIFF QUESTION.

The Bill to reduce the duties on Imports, and for other purposes, being under consideration—

Mr. NILES said:

Mr. President: Being, sir, so unfortunate as to differ from most of my friends on this side of the Chamber, on this great measure, and, perhaps, from some of my friends at home, it is due to myself and to them, that I should assign some of the reasons for my opinions, and for the vote which I may feel it my duty to give on this bill.

In doing this, I am aware of the delicacy of my position, and of the embarrassment attending it, as in the discussion of this question, with that freedom which is required to do justice to my opinions, I may be in danger of treading on the toes of my friends on the one hand, and of getting into the shoes of my opponents on the other.

It will be my purpose, however, to avoid both, as far as I am, as it is not my wish to embarrass the action of any one. Opposed as I apparently am to many of my friends, it might be thought sufficient for me to give a silent vote on this question; and such would have been the conclusion of my own mind, were it not that the bill before the Senate is, in my judgment, a very extreme measure, containing novel and dangerous principles, and fraught, should it become a law, with the most serious and alarming consequences. I have a duty to discharge to my constituents, whose rights, in my judgment, are menaced by this bill, which cannot be yielded up to any personal or party considerations.

I had supposed, Mr. President, that the agitation and discussion of this subject for thirty years in these Halls, and in almost every way and form elsewhere, and the enactment of numerous laws, with the experience we have had of their operation, had done something towards settling the principles of a tariff of revenue, and that little now remained to be done except to arrange and adjust its details. But in this, it seems, I have been mistaken, and that the experience of the past is lost, if not upon the country, at least upon Congress. Instead of the principles of a tariff being settled, and the extreme doctrines on the subject being narrowed down, it appears that the whole field of controversy is still open, and wider than ever; that new principles are introduced, more startling than any which have been heretofore advocated; that the controversy is to be revived with more fierceness, and in a manner involving deeper interests, than at any time heretofore. Sir, I regret this, deeply regret it. But I suppose the agitation must go on, sweeping over the country, and becoming more violent as the interests involved have

become more extensive and important. How blind to the lessons of experience! Have we not heretofore witnessed, in the agitations of this subject, threatened resistance to the laws, if not danger to the Union? When shall we learn wisdom and moderation? When shall we become satisfied that the wounds of one extreme measure cannot be healed by another measure equally extreme in the opposite direction? My hopes of reaching a quiet haven after so long a voyage on this agitated ocean, almost sunk within me, when, at the commencement of the present session, I read the report from the Treasury Department. But even then I did not suppose that a bill so novel in its principles, so alarming in its consequences, so hostile to all the great interests of the country, could ever have found its way into this Chamber. My disappointment has been great, my regrets beyond what I can express.

Mr. President, before I proceed to examine the principles and details of this bill, both of which I intend to consider, I must be indulged in some preliminary observations. It seems to be supposed by some, that notwithstanding my disapproval of this bill, I might give it my support, because I am opposed to the act of 1842. This would depend in part upon the relative merits or demerits of the existing and the proposed law. In this comparison, should the defects of the present and proposed law be found nearly equal, I could not give the latter my support. I had no agency in passing the existing law, and am in no way responsible for it; but should this bill become a law by my vote, it would be assuming a responsibility that I am unwilling to take upon me. To get rid of one bad law by another bad law, is a principle of legislation that I can never act upon. I think the true course is, to let the old law remain, until it can be replaced by an act which will, in my judgment, be reasonably satisfactory to the country. But, in my opinion, this bill is in every respect more objectionable than the act of 1842, defective as that may be. That act embraces no new principles, and is defective only in its details, or some of its provisions. It is too highly protective in its character; its minimum principle is highly objectionable, and some of the specific duties are prohibitory, others nearly so, and the duties in some cases are the same on a low-priced article as on one of much greater value. These are serious defects, and require to be remedied. It must, however, be admitted, that that act has in some respects operated well. That the country has been prosperous under it cannot be denied. As a revenue measure, it has succeeded beyond the expectations of its warmest friends. It

has furnished an ample revenue, yet not more than was desirable, in the condition of the country, with a debt of nearly \$20,000,000. It has not only produced a sufficient but a steady revenue; for during the three years it has been in operation, the revenue has varied less than \$1,000,000. The imports also have exhibited great steadiness and uniformity. As a revenue measure, therefore, there is no occasion to change it, and especially at a time when the country is involved in war. But if anything was to be done, the true course would have been a reasonable and equitable modification of the act of 1842. Had such a bill been prepared, I should cheerfully have given it my support. But this bill introduces new principles, it revolutionizes the whole system; and should it become a law, the effect of it no one can foresee. It is at best but an experiment; and no one can tell what its practical operation will be, either on the revenue, or the great interests of the country which will be brought within its influence.

But it seems to be assumed that this is an Administration measure, and that, as a friend of this Administration there is an obligation on me to give it my support. If this assumption is correct, if this is a measure of the Administration, I can only say that I regret it, profoundly regret it; as I fear it will prove disastrous to its authors, should it become a law. How has it happened that this has become an Administration measure? No Administration before ever assumed the responsibility of hazarding its popularity on a tariff bill. Neither General Jackson nor Mr. Van Buren ventured upon so hazardous a course. The tariff is a delicate subject, connected with the various and diversified interests of the country, which are supposed to be somewhat in conflict in the different sections of the Union. And if the real or supposed interests of different sections of the Union are in conflict, so far as they may be affected by a tariff law, how can such a question be brought within the province of party? Are not the opinions of the Democrats of the North and of the South greatly at variance on this question? Those of the West may vary a shade from either; indeed, there are scarcely two States in the Union in which the sentiments of the democracy are in perfect harmony on the subject of the tariff. How, then, can an Administration, supported by some States in every section of the Union, undertake to control this question, without necessarily disaffecting a portion of its friends? If it attempts to sustain the views of one section, will it not come in conflict with those of another?

But if it was to attempt to settle this great question of domestic policy, it is clear that it could only be done on the principle of a reasonable compromise. Its policy should be national, not sectional; and the measure it proposed should be moderate, avoiding the extreme doctrines on both sides. Is this such a bill? Far from it. On the contrary, it is an extreme measure, based on new principles, which, so far as I know, have never been recognised in any State in the Union, except it be South Carolina. The unqualified free-trade principles of this bill are substantially the same as those set up in the State referred to, in opposition to the tariff of 1833, and which produced that fearful agitation

and crisis that was arrested by the Compromise act of 1833. I have ever believed it inexpedient and wrong to make the adjustment of the tariff a party question. It is making the great interests of the country the sport of political partisans, and to rise or fall with the changing fortunes of the two great parties which control the political destinies of the country. This Administration has no truer or more disinterested friend than I am; I have sustained it, and will continue to sustain it; but on this question, I must say to the Administration, as Edmund Burke did to his constituents, the electors of Bristol: "I will maintain your interests against your opinions, with a constancy that becomes me." I will, if I can, save you from the consequences of a measure, which, in my judgment, can hardly fail of proving disastrous to you as well as the country. And why has the Administration brought forward this measure? Is it assumed that the tariff question was one of the issues in the election of 1844? That that question was involved in that election, to a certain extent, may be admitted. But did that contest involve this bill, or the principles of this bill? Was that a question between the doctrines of free trade and the protective policy, so far as it is incident to revenue? No one, I think, will hazard the assertion that it was. At the North the question was between an ultra protective tariff and a moderate protective system, incidental to revenue. It was a question, whether the tariff of 1842 should stand as it is, or be modified so as to correct its prohibitory and high duties, and render it more consistent with all the great interests of the country. Is this a bill of that character? If I thought it was, it should have my support. But I regard it as a bill based on the unqualified principles of free trade, and repudiating the entire protective policy. That such is its real character, it is my purpose to endeavor to show, both in respect to its principles and details.

Having, Mr. President, disposed of these preliminary questions, I now proceed to examine the bill before the Senate in its general principles and in its details, and to state my objections to its passage. My first objection is in respect to the time in which it is brought forward. Is the present a suitable time to attempt to revise and readjust the revenue and tariff system? The country is now involved in a war; and although this war may be deemed a small affair, it will, if it continues, be a very expensive one. It is to be prosecuted without the limits of the United States, in a country where few supplies can be obtained; and every circumstance attending it will render its operations very expensive. It has already subjected us to a heavy expense, and we are now borrowing money to carry it on. Instead of providing additional revenues to meet this extraordinary expenditure, we are called on to reduce the existing revenue system. Is this wise—is it prudent? Will you enter upon an untried system of revenue, at a time when there is so heavy a demand on your treasury? But aside from the danger to the revenue, is this a time to attempt to remodell the revenue laws? This should not be attempted, except under circumstances affording a reasonable prospect of securing permanency to your new law; and to do this, the finances of the country must be in a set-

bled state, so that the duties can be adjusted to the wants of the treasury. Can this be done in time of war? Changes in the revenue laws are liable to affect all the great interests of the country, and should not be attempted but for strong reasons. If such reasons exist at this time, pray what are they, and why are they not pointed out? If they have been, I have not been so fortunate as to learn what they are.

I pass, Mr. President, to my second objection to this bill, which is, *the manner* in which it has been prepared. This is an Executive or Treasury scheme, which Congress is only called on to sanction. A year ago, the Secretary of the Treasury sent out circulars, to obtain information concerning the manufacturing interests of the country, to the Federal officers, who handed them to anybody who would take them and return an answer to the questions. Very few, I believe, fell into the hands of men at all competent to give the information required. This was the first movement; and at the commencement of the session of Congress, the Secretary, in his financial report, presented the outlines or principles of his scheme of revenue. It was rather novel and startling; but being perhaps regarded as a mere theory, no great alarm was felt. Soon after, he summoned a number of subordinate custom-house officers, to aid him in the details of his plan, and they assembled in a room in the Treasury building, constituting a sort of special Congress, or supplement to the Congress convened in these Halls. They remained in session some months, and finally they were transferred to the room of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House. I will not stop to inquire under what grant in the Constitution this supplemental Congress was convened; but it is a little remarkable that the most important measure of the session—what has since been called the “great measure of the age”—was confided to this Congress of custom-house officers, whilst the Congress assembled in this Capitol was employed upon private petitions, private claims, and other small matters.

That in all this, the intentions of the Secretary were good, I have no doubt; yet it appears to me, that the whole thing was misconceived. I think, sir, there is great objection to this whole proceeding. The levying of taxes, in any way, has ever been considered by our British ancestors, and by our American ancestors, as involving the vital principles of liberty, and as belonging exclusively to the Representatives of the people. So jealousy has this right been regarded, that the levying by the Crown of a small tax, called ship-money, occasioned a revolution and civil war in England, which cost the Sovereign his head; and the levying of a few cents tax on tea, gave rise to our glorious Revolution, which resulted in the independence of this great country. And so cautious were the framers of the Constitution, that they confined the originating of tax bills to the House of Representatives. To the Senate, therefore, this power is denied; yet the Secretary of the Treasury, with the aid of a council constituted by himself, has prepared this bill, both in its principles and details, except so far as the latter may have been modified by the Committee of Ways and Means of the other House.

There is another reason why a tax bill, and especially a bill imposing duties on imports, should be prepared by the immediate Representatives of the people, which is, that they affect all classes and all interests, which should be justly and properly represented by those who are to frame and prepare the law. This could not be done by a few custom-house officers representing none of the great interests of the country; and perhaps equally ignorant and regardless of them. It is rather unfortunate that a revenue bill, affecting all the commercial, manufacturing, and navigating interests of the North, should have been exclusively in the hands, in its preparation, of two southern planters; and that no one, so far as I know, from the States most interested, should have been consulted on the subject.

I now proceed, Mr. President, to examine this bill in its general principles and its details, and to subject them to the test of those principles which were recognised by the fathers of our political church, and all who have adhered to the primitive faith of Democracy.

I have already stated that the general principles of this bill are novel and dangerous in their consequences. They are the principles of free trade, with the exclusion of all discrimination, as incidental to revenue, to favor the productions or industry of the country. And in connexion with these, is the principle of *ad valorem* duties, never before introduced as a general rule of assessing duties. These principles are laid down and attempted to be defended by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his financial report at the commencement of the session. The Secretary comes forward with a new theory, which, it is said, in a certain quarter, none of his predecessors ever had courage to advance. It is certainly true, that none of those who have preceded him ever advocated such a theory; but whether for want of courage, or want of confidence in its principles, cannot be very doubtful. Neither Mr. Galkin, Mr. Dallas, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Ingham, or Mr. Woodbury, nor any other Democratic Secretary, ever advocated or gave countenance to such doctrines.

This report, in imitation of the ancient and long-since exploded philosophy, lays down certain abstract principles or categories, which are to control and regulate the entire revenue and tariff system. The first principle is, that no more revenue should be raised than is necessary to an economical administration of the Government. To this rule all will probably assent. The second principle is, that in all cases the lowest rate of duty should be imposed which will produce the largest amount of revenue; that there may be discriminations below this rate for revenue, and for special reasons some articles may be admitted free of duty. This is the governing principle of the whole system, and it is apparent that it excludes all discrimination, as incident to revenue, to favor the products of the country, or the labor of the country, or to counteract the legislation of other countries. You are only to discriminate in the descending scale, and that for revenue only. The maximum rate is a revenue duty, and the lowest point of revenue duty; and to discriminate below that, certainly cannot be for protection. It is but justice

to the Secretary to state that he does not, in express terms, deny that there ought to be any discrimination for protection; but he nowhere asserts that there should be; and his principles certainly entirely exclude all discrimination for protection, as incidental to revenue. To discriminate in the descending scale, from the lowest rate which will produce the greatest amount of revenue, is to discriminate against protection. This is perfectly clear; for to reduce the duty, is to favor and increase importations to the injury of home productions. The President, if I mistake not, speaks about discriminations within the revenue standard. But what is the revenue standard? Can any one tell? Is it the rule laid down by the Secretary—the *lowest rate of duty*—which will produce the greatest amount of revenue? If this is the revenue standard, then, as I have shown, there can be no discrimination for protection within the revenue standard, as you can only discriminate by reducing the rate of duty, which will increase importations at the expense of the home production. The true revenue standard is a rate of duty which will produce revenue, and a reasonable amount of revenue; but by no means the largest amount of revenue, as that would be to favor the largest amount of importations. If there is any general principle to be adopted in arranging a tariff of duties, it should be this: to ascertain what is the average rate of duty required to produce the whole revenue demanded for an economical administration of the Government, and then to discriminate above that rate for protection, and also to throw a heavier tax on luxuries, and below it, to lighten the burdens of taxation and to favor articles of general or universal consumption. Suppose the average rate of duty for revenue to be 30 per cent., which is said to be the case by the Secretary of the Treasury in 1845: the discrimination for protection must be above that rate, except in respect to raw materials entering into the elements of manufactured products; and the discriminations below that rate are for revenue, or to lighten the burdens of taxation. There are two rates of duties which may be considered as protective—those above the average revenue standard, on articles interfering with those produced in the country, and those below the average rate, or admitted without duty, on raw materials. This presents the matter in a very simple light, and will enable us to decide on the true character of this bill. This is no theory, but is simply taking the facts of the case as the only safe basis for arranging a system of revenue duties with incidental protection. But in regard to abstract theories, whether of free trade or protection, not originating in the facts of the case, not having their source in the actual condition of the country, they are not only idle and profitless speculations, but mischievous and dangerous. Sir, I hold all such theories in utter contempt, as beneath the regard of statesmen, and subversive of all sound legislation. There are no theories, no general principles on this subject, possessing the authority of universal truth, or universal application. A system of revenue, whether on free-trade principles or protective principles, may be suitable and proper for one country, and very unsuitable for another. Every country should form and adopt a

revenue system adapted to the condition, pursuits, and interests of its own people. To adopt a system resting on any other basis, on any abstract theory, is to disregard entirely the interests of the country, and to expose them to be sacrificed. It is to sport with the rights, the interests, and the labor of the people. This sport, like the fable of the boys and the frogs, may be very agreeable to speculative theorists and speculative politicians, but it may be death to the people whose interests and employments are crushed by it. Revenue laws should be adopted like all other laws, not in pursuance of a theory, but by carefully examining the facts in every particular case of duty imposed, and perceiving, so far as human sagacity can do it, aided by experience, what is to be the practical operation of the law, what are to be its effects and consequences, not only directly, but collaterally and indirectly.

Will you confine your view only to the direct effect of a particular duty, which your law imposes? This is merely to put a sum of money into the treasury. But the consequences of getting this money may be very mischievous, as, in case of a high duty on a raw material, it may break down a large branch of industry, and deprive a large number of persons of their employment. Will not a wise and prudent legislator look at these consequences? Will he not regard them; and if the injury is to be serious, will he not inquire whether the same revenue cannot be raised by a duty on some other article, not productive of such consequences? Will he not perceive the folly or impolicy of such a tax, viewed in regard to revenue only? because, the persons thrown out of employment may have consumed other articles of importation, on which a greater amount of revenue was collected; so that what is gained by the tax on the raw material, will be lost, and perhaps twice the amount, on other importations.

There is no other sound principle in imposing duties on imports, but to make the burden of the tax as light as possible, and the effect and consequences of it as little injurious, or as beneficial as possible. That is, to do the least injury on the one hand, and the great consequential benefit on the other, that is consistent with the object, which is to put a certain sum of money into the treasury. And this cannot be determined by any theory, but upon the facts applicable to every particular duty imposed. This will be to do the least injury and the greatest good to the greatest number; which I believe, sir, is sound democracy. At any rate, it is sound legislation. How far these plain common-sense views are in harmony with this bill, I shall endeavor to show. I have thus far been examining the theory of the free-trade principles of the Secretary, on which this bill, as I shall endeavor to make it appear, is founded, and not the bill itself.

There is one other general principle laid down by the Secretary, and which all will admit is carried out in the bill. I allude to the uniform *ad valorem* principle. Why is this principle, for the first time, pressed upon us? Why are we called on at a time like this, when the country is engaged in war, to change the whole revenue system, and enter upon an untried experiment? In respect to

the principle by which revenue is to be assessed, all must admit that the rule which is the most certain, steady, and uniform, and least liable to evasion, is the best. And who can doubt that specific duties, where the article admits of that principle, is the best, as combining most of these advantages? It is best for revenue, and best to guard the home production; because the tax is steady and uniform. It does not vary with the change of commercial markets. The ad valorem principle is a mere sliding scale; not like the English corn laws, but on an inverse principle. By the corn-law scale, the duty diminished as the price of the article increased. The duty decreased as the price of wheat advanced, and increased as the price of wheat fell; and when it reached a certain point in the ascending scale, the duty ceased. But this sliding scale is the reverse. The duty increases as the price of the article increases. The duty is the highest when the price is the greatest and the people least able to pay it. When the price of the article is the highest in foreign ports, the duty advances; and so far as it operates as a protection to home productions, the protection is greatest when it is least needed. On the other hand, when prices fall in foreign countries the duty is diminished, and affords the least protection when it is most required. To illustrate this, take the article of iron, which has varied in price, in Wales, from three pounds sterling a ton, to twenty pounds. When at the former price, the duty at 30 per cent. would be twelve shillings; when worth twenty pounds the duty would be sixty shillings—five times as much.

In periods of commercial activity and excitement prices advance, and at these periods importations increase, and the rate of duty on the article will likewise increase, and you will have an overflowing treasury. Then comes a commercial revulsion, and prices fall, and down comes your duties, and you have an empty treasury. Molasses varies in price, at Havana and other places of export, from two cents a gallon to twenty cents. Thirty per cent., at two cents a gallon, makes the duty six mills; and at twenty cents the duty will be six cents per gallon. A friend of mine, engaged in the West India trade, recently informed me that he had had molasses given to him, without money and without price; he had been told to produce his casks, and they should be filled; and he said he had imported molasses in that way. How would you apply your ad valorem principle to such a case, and what would the duty be? I think this would be a poser to the advocates of the ad valorem system. But an article obtained so dog cheap, could well afford to bear a duty. A ton of iron, or a gallon of molasses, are as valuable for use when at the low price, as at the high; the one will make no more axes or hoes, and the other will sweeten no more gingerbread, at the high rate than at the low; yet your law will tax it six times as much. Sugar, raisins, and all articles of merchandise, vary 50 per cent. in the places from whence they are exported, and your duties must fluctuate accordingly—rising and falling 50 per cent. What stability can there be in your financial system, with revenue laws resting on such a basis? We have always had some ad valorem duties; there are some articles which do not admit of specific duties; but specific duties

should be the general rule, and ad valorem duties the exceptions.

Another objection, Mr. President, to ad valorem duties is, the greater facilities they afford for frauds upon the revenue, which are at the same time a fraud upon the honest importer, and upon the manufacturer. The chairman of the Committee of Finance [Mr. Lewis] has told us that no frauds have been proved, and that no one makes any complaint of frauds by false invoices but the manufacturers. And this statement is hazarded in the face of the fact that there is on our table a remonstrance, signed by all the importers of Boston, saying that if this law passes they must discontinue their business, as no honest importer could sustain a competition with dishonest foreigners and the unscrupulous importers among our own citizens. And as to frauds, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Evans] has shown that forty-seven cases of frauds were proved in our courts some years since. But most of these frauds evidently escape detection, as it is extremely difficult to obtain the proof to establish the fact. That they have existed extensively, no commercial man, neacquainted with the subject, entertains a doubt. But I will not pursue this objection, as it was so fully gone into by the Senator from Maine.

I will now proceed, Mr. President, to examine the details of this bill, and see how far it is framed upon the free-trade principles of the Secretary of the Treasury, as put forth in his report, and which I have already examined. The duties are not arranged upon the horizontal principle of one circle, but upon several circles. To decide whether this bill is framed on the principles of free trade, or the principle of incidental protection, we must first look at the extreme rates or classes, the high rates, and the lowest, and free rates. The highest class are at a rate of 100 per cent. duty, consisting of spirits, and a few other articles. The second class are at the rate of 40 per cent., and this embraces spices, fruits, and other articles, all of which, with one exception—*tobacco*, and the manufactures of tobacco—are articles not manufactured or produced in this country. I will now look at the class of free articles; and here we find but a single article, and that of little importance, (*platina*), which is a raw material, or used in manufacturing. In the act of 1842, there is a large list of free articles, embracing dye stuffs, raw metals, and various raw articles used by the mechanics and manufacturers of the country. In the act of 1833, as modified by that of 1833, there is a much larger list of free articles; so large, that, under those acts, one-half of the whole imports for several years were free of duty. This, of course, threw almost the whole duties upon what are called the protected articles, which interfered with home productions. This was undoubtedly wrong, and was carrying the protective principle to an extreme length. But I have heard no complaint of the free list in the act of '42; and I would ask, why it is that so entire a change has been made in this respect? Why is it, that the raw materials used in the arts by our mechanics and manufacturers, which heretofore have been imported free of duty, are now to be subjected to duties? These articles are admitted free of duty in England and other manufacturing countries, not-

withstanding their system of taxation is so heavy and burdensome. In England, it is said, there are now several hundred articles imported free of duty.

It is the policy of all nations, where the arts exist, to import raw materials free of duty. This has been an important feature in the policy of Sir Robert Peel; and he has, within a few years, reduced the duty on seven hundred and fifty articles; and entirely removed it from four hundred and thirty. Is not a tax on raw materials calculated to discourage rather than to encourage mechanical and manufacturing industry and products? Is it not subjecting our mechanics and artisans to disadvantages and burdens to which those of England and other countries are not subject? Is it not, in fact, a tax on labor, and calculated to give an advantage to foreign labor over American labor in our own markets? Whether this was the design or not, certainly such is the effect of the law. This is a very strange policy; a strange kind of protection to American industry.

We see, then, that in the two highest classes of duties, and in the lowest, or free list, there is not only no protection, but the principle is reversed. In a system of incidental protection, the class of the highest rate of duties are articles of the description produced in the country; and the free list consists of raw materials used in the arts. In this bill, the two classes of highest duties are not produced in the country, except tobacco; and raw materials are not in the free list, but subject to duty. And why is tobacco made an exception, and protected by a higher rate of duty than any other article? Are tobacco and the manufactures of tobacco entitled to special favor? Are they of greater importance and utility than iron and woollens? This bill, sir, has a strange southern squint; it is constantly squinting at cotton and tobacco. Perhaps, sir, I am wrong in saying that this bill has no protective principle in it; there are two articles that are protected—tobacco and sardines, a kind of fish preserved in oil; they are protected, one by a duty of forty, and the other by a duty of one hundred per cent. It may therefore be supposed that if this bill should become a law, the sardine business will hereafter be flourishing. Well, sir, perhaps we should be thankful for small favors, and rejoice that all the interests of the country are not abandoned: tobacco and sardines are certainly well taken care of, and we may hope for a flourishing trade in them, and that will be better than nothing.

But, Mr. President, I maintain that the true test by which we are to determine whether any tariff bill contains any general principle of incidental protection, is this: if it contains that principle, the class of articles commonly called protected articles, being of the description of like articles produced in the country, must be subject to a rate of duty above the general average rate of duty necessary to produce the requisite amount of revenue. If they are not above that rate, the duty is merely a revenue duty. We have, then, to inquire what is that average rate; and here, sir, we have the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, that in 1845, it was 29.90 per cent., a fraction short of 30 per cent. The highest class of protected articles in this bill, with the exception of tobacco, is 30 per

cent., the average rate of duties required for revenue. Where, then, is your discrimination in favor of American productions and labor? As I have already stated, the discrimination is against protection, as the two classes of the highest rates of duty are articles not produced in the country. It is true that under this bill the average rate of duty is estimated at 23½ or 24 per cent., so that there would be a shade of protection in the 30 per cent. class. But this bill, as I shall attempt to show, will not produce the required revenue for the ordinary expenses of the Government, without an increase of importations of thirty or forty millions, which the country can neither pay for nor consume. Nothing short of 30 per cent. as the average rate of duties, will give us the requisite amount of revenue, as the importations of 1845 were large, beyond the exports of the year, and requiring four millions of specie to pay for the excess. It is clear, then, that not one of the class regarded as protected articles, except tobacco, has even one per cent. discrimination in its favor.

Mr. President, I will now proceed to examine, more in detail, the arrangement of the rates of duties on different articles, and see how far, and in what way, the productions and labor of the country are taken care of. I will commence with wool and woollens. The duty on wool unmanufactured is 30 per cent.; on manufactures of wool, or of which wool is a component part, not otherwise provided for, 30 per cent.; on carpeting 30 per cent.; on baizes, bookings, and flannels, 25 per cent.; on manufactures of worsted, or of which worsted is a component part, 25 per cent.; on blankets of all kinds 20 per cent.; on woollen listings 20 per cent. The average duty on the manufactures of wool is 25 per cent., and on wool unmanufactured, 30 per cent. The discrimination here is five per cent. against the manufactured article. This is a sort of Irish principle of protection, the discrimination to favor the manufactured article, being an *advance* one per cent. lower. The wool and woollen interest is one of the great interests of the country, and no other is entitled to more favor or consideration. There is a greater population now concerned in the growing of wool and the manufactures thereof than there is in growing cotton. The States of Vermont, New York, and Pennsylvania, are the great wool-growing States; but the business is extending into Ohio, and other States northwest of the Ohio river, which at no distant day will be the great wool-growing States in the Union. As sheep can be wintered without housing or much expense, wool can be raised in those States as cheap as on the vast prairies of Buenos Ayres, and at eight or ten cents a pound will afford a good profit. A friend lately informed me of the sale of a lot of fifty thousand pounds of wool from Ohio in the town of my residence to a carpet manufacturer, being the first lot ever received there from that State; and I learn from a merchant in Chicago that five hundred thousand pounds have been sent the present season from that place to markets in the eastern States, at an expense for freight of sixty-two cents per hundred pounds; and it costs fifty cents from Buffalo, or in the western section of New York on the line of the canal. One advantage which the wool interest

will possess in those States over the grain interest, is in the greater value of the article, according to its weight, and the consequent saving in the expense in getting it to market.

It will be perceived that wool is both an agricultural and a manufacturing interest, and that they cannot be separated, for we cannot depend on foreign markets for wool. A small amount was exported last year, yet we imported nearly twenty-four millions of pounds. To destroy the manufactures of wool would be fatal to the wool-growing interest, by taking away the home market. And if you ruin the wool-growing interest, you force the agriculturists engaged in it into the dairy business, which will then suffer from over production.

In view of the vast importance of the wool and woollens interest, sound policy requires that it should be placed on a sure and safe foundation. Will this bill afford that security? Thirty per cent. duty might be sufficient were it not that the duty on the raw material is a countervailing duty, not to the full amount, but to a considerable extent. I do not object to thirty per cent. on wool, but there should certainly be some discrimination; but instead of that, the discrimination on certain manufactures of wool is the other way, the duty being less on the manufactured article than on the raw material.

My own State is pretty largely concerned in the woollen manufacture, and supplies a market for the wool of Vermont, New York, and other States, there being very little produced in the State. There are probably ten millions of pounds of wool required for the woollen and carpet factories in Connecticut. How can the carpet business stand under this bill? It uses foreign wool chiefly, subject to the same duty as the manufactured product. It would have no protection against the foreign article, and must certainly fall. The woollen establishments in Connecticut, except those in the carpet business, are all small; they are owned by the farmers and small capitalists, and are, in every respect, a popular interest; and this bill, in my judgment, will afford them no adequate security.

Intimately connected with the wool and woollen interest, is that of made-up clothing. Clothing ready made, and wearing apparel of every description, of whatever material composed, made up or manufactured, in whole or in part, by the tailor or seamstress, is subject to a duty of 30 per cent.—the same as the duty on the cloth from which it is made. The principle on which duties are imposed, when there is any encouragement intended to be given to the labor of the country, is, to increase the rate of duty in a manner to correspond with the increase of labor which has entered into the article. Clothing has the additional labor of making the cloth into garments; and is not this an employment deserving of some favor? It is mainly confined to our cities, and affords labor and wages to females, many of whom have no other means of subsistence. Their earnings are small at best, and this bill will either deprive them of their employment, or bring their wages down to a level with the half-starved population of Europe.

I pass on, as I cannot enlarge on these various subjects, to iron, which is the great manufacturing interest of the country. This interest, great as it

is, is more recklessly overlooked, and put into greater jeopardy, than any other. The duties are arranged as follows: Iron, in bars, blooms, bolts, loops, pigs, rods, slabs, or other form, not otherwise provided for, 30 per cent.; castings of iron, vessels of cast-iron, 30 per cent.; old or scrap iron, 30 per cent.; steel, not otherwise provided for, 20 per cent.; cutlery of all kinds, 30 per cent.; steel, shear and German, 15 per cent.; manufactures of iron, not enumerated, 20 per cent. Here we see the striking defects of this bill, in regard to its details, in the want of a proper division and classification of articles in different stages of manufacture, which should be subject to different rates of duties according to the amount of labor bestowed upon them. Iron, in one stage of manufacture, is a raw material for iron in a more improved state of manufacture. Iron in pigs, the most crude form, is used for manufacturing iron in bars, hammered or rolled, bolts, sheets, hoops, and other forms; the amount of labor on all of which differ very materially, and have heretofore been subject to very different rates of duties. By the act of 1842, pig-iron is subject to a duty of nine dollars per ton; bar iron, hammered, seventeen dollars; and bar, rolled, twenty-five dollars per ton; iron in sheets, rods, hoops, &c., two and a half cents per pound, or fifty-six dollars per ton; hardware, and manufactures of iron, from 30 per cent. to twelve cents per pound. The rates are generally very high, and would bear a liberal reduction; but the proper proportions in the rates of duties should be maintained. In the present law, there is a difference of from nine dollars a ton to fifty-six dollars a ton for the different forms of iron, which, in this bill, are thrown into the same class, and subjected to a uniform rate of duty of 30 per cent. Why is this? Is it intended to destroy all manufactures of iron except the most crude and simple forms? All, except pig and hammered bar-iron? Whether even these can stand under this bill, I have no means of deciding; but it is certain that the more improved forms cannot stand a reduction of duty from 75 to 80 per cent. Let me call the attention of the Senate to the effect of this bill on sheet-iron. I have received a statement from an importing house in New York, from which it appears that the sheet-iron this house has imported from the first of 1842 to the last of 1845, has been invoiced in England at from £8 5s. to £9 10s. per ton—the average being about £9 per ton. Nine pounds sterling, per ton, at \$1 84 to the pound, is \$13 56 per ton, as the cost in England; the duty on which, at 30 per cent., is \$13 61. The present duty per ton, of 2240 pounds, is fifty-six dollars, making a difference of \$42 39, or a reduction of about 80 per cent. Can it be supposed that any business, depending in any degree on the duty on the imported article, can be sustained with so large and sudden a reduction of the duty as this? And is it not every way unjust, not only to the manufacturer, but to the importer, who may have a very large stock on hand? Must it not suddenly, by the effect of your law, depreciate largely the value of the whole stock in the market? \*

\* I am informed, that since the passage of the bill, pig



Is this bill intended to destroy the manufactures of iron—to crush the great interests of Pennsylvania and other States, my own among others? If it is not, why has there not been some discrimination between iron in its different forms and values? Instead of this, so far as there is any discrimination, it is on the same Irish principle of protection—the highest rate of duties is on the crude article or raw material, and the lower rate on the more improved or more expensively-manufactured article.

Steel is manufactured from iron, mostly from Swedish iron, and yet is to pay a duty of only 20 and 15 per cent., whilst the iron from which it is made pays 30 per cent. Steel is manufactured in the United States; and in what condition will this bill place the American manufacturer who has to compete with the British manufacturer in the American market? The members of the little Congress who were convened to arrange the details of this bill, do not seem to have known quite every thing; and if they had possessed a little more knowledge on this subject, they might have consented to have placed the American manufacturer of steel a little nearer an equality with the British manufacturer. How would they stand under this law? Steel in both countries is made from Swedish iron, subject to a duty in England, I think, of 10 per cent., and in the United States of 30 per cent. Ten per cent. on the iron in England, and 20 per cent. on the imported steel, would subject the English manufacture to 30 per cent. duty, the same the American manufacturer has to pay on his iron, giving the British manufacturer the advantage of cheaper labor and cheaper capital. But this is not all: the English law relieves the manufacturer from the duty on the iron by way of drawback on the steel he exports to this country; so that he will pay 10 per cent. less duty than the American manufacturer. Such is the protection, incidental or accidental, which this bill affords to the American laborer. Cutlery is protected by a revenue duty of 30 per cent., the same as the duty on iron, which gives no advantage to the American over the British manufacturer. Wire, which is made in the country in which I reside, pays a duty of from 5 to 11 cents per pound, by the present law, and by this bill falls into the class of unenumerated manufactures of iron, and will pay a duty of 20 per cent., a reduction so sweeping as to ruin the business. This manufacture commenced more than thirty years ago, and has grown up under the protection of your laws. Will you now destroy it? I might name nails, wood-screws, and other articles, placed in the same situation. In what condition does this bill place the blacksmiths, mechanics, and laborers of all kinds, employed in the various manufactures of iron? Why, sir, it protects them on the Irish principle of a duty of 10 per cent. against them. The bill offers a bounty of 10 per cent. to British manufactures of iron over

iron has fallen nine dollars per ton, and bar iron fifteen dollars. I am also informed that a merchant in New York has had a certain number of barrels of sugar arrive since the act passed, and that instead of paying the duties, he put the sugar into the public store-houses, to remain until the 1st of December, so as to pay the duties under the new law, and in this way will save four thousand dollars.

American mechanics and laborers engaged in the same business. Is it not written that charity begins at home, and that he who does not take care of his own household is worse than an infidel? Surely, then, sir, this bill is a great sinner against the laws of God and man. No wonder, sir, in view of these protective discriminations, that this bill has been called the "great measure of the age;" and should it pass, it may become the eighth wonder of the world.

I pass on to paper, a business of which I have some knowledge, as I was so unfortunate as to be a paper manufacturer myself some ten years ago. One great objection to manufacturers now seems to be, that they are becoming too everlastingly rich; but I came very near being made everlastingly poor. The duty on paper in this bill is 30 per cent., and on rags five per cent. By the present law, the duty on paper is from 17 to 12½ cents per pound, with some coarse sorts at lower rates; and rags pay a duty of one-fourth of a cent a pound. A ream of quarto post, or letter paper, weighing five pounds, would pay a duty of 25 cents. A ream of light letter paper in France is sold for 75 cents, so that the duty at 30 per cent. would be but 22½ cents, a reduction of 62½ cents. The duty under the act of 1842 is higher than is required; but so great a reduction will injure many kinds of the paper manufacture. In this, as on other articles, there is no discrimination between the fine high papers and the coarser and less valuable sorts. But perhaps the most objectionable part of the paper rates is the duty on printed books and magazines, which is but 10 per cent., and on periodicals for republication 20 per cent.; and 20 per cent. on paper hangings. It is well known that from the low price of paper and the great improvements in printing, books can now be published extremely cheap. I am informed that a standard lexicon, a large volume, which sells here at \$5, retail, and about \$3 to the trade, can be published in England, imported to the United States and pay the duty, at a cost not exceeding \$1 44; and that it could not be published here short of \$2. It is easy to see that all the standard English works will be likely to be published in England and sent to the United States. The publisher will publish an edition sufficient to supply the home demand, on which he will get a fair profit, and then publish such additional copies as he thinks can be sold in the United States at such reduced profit as he can get. This will be likely greatly to injure the American booksellers and publishers, and those engaged in the book-binding business, and it will withdraw from the American papermaker the market for the paper used in these publications. The printers will also be injured in their business—a very intelligent class of mechanics. If we import our books, we encourage British papermakers, British printers and bookbinders, and British literature and politics. It is our true policy to encourage a national literature of our own, and as independent of that of England as possible. This bill will leave the papermaker only that part of the market for printing-paper arising from newspapers, periodicals, school books, &c. The paper manufacture is an interest entitled to great favor; its annual value is about \$9,000,000, nearly all of which is the product of labor, as the raw material

is really of no value, and would be entirely lost if not made into paper. Rags would not be worth exporting from this country; we have imported rags largely, but as the home supply increases we now import less. The American paper has to pay a duty on foreign rags, besides the freight, and they cost 50 or 75 per cent. more than in England or France; and on paper exported from England there is a drawback of one-and-a-half penny the pound. From these circumstances, and the lower rate of wages, the foreign manufacture must, under the rate of duties in this bill, monopolize a share of the American market. And why injure a pursuit which is a clear gain to the country? Dr. Franklin said that every fish drawn from the ocean was a piece of silver added to the wealth of the country; and the same is true of every ream of paper manufactured, which costs little or nothing but the labor. What is said of imported books will apply to paper hangings, which are protected by a duty of 10 per cent. less than that on the paper.

I pass on, sir, to notice wood unmanufactured, which is subject to a duty of 30 per cent., and the same rate of duty on manufactures of wood, or of which wood is a component part. By the present law, Brazil wood is free, and rose wood, satin wood, mahogany, and cedar, are at a duty of 15 per cent.; the manufactures of wood at 30 per cent. Why is this discrimination of 15 per cent. taken away from the cabinet-makers and other workers in wood? Is it to encourage the importation of French furniture, and engender a fastidious taste for foreign luxuries, to the injury of the American mechanic?

The next article to which I will call the attention of the Senate is ivory and its manufactures. This is a business in my own State, and almost confined to it. Ivory is now imported free; and by this bill is subjected to a duty of 5 per cent., and a duty of 30 per cent. on combs of all sorts. Ivory is free of duty in England, which virtually reduces the duty on combs 5 per cent., so far as respects the English manufactured article in the United States. But the combs manufactured here are exported to the West Indies and South American States, and in those markets the English manufacturers will have 5 per cent. advantage, aside from that of cheaper labor. Whether this interest can be sustained under this bill, I cannot determine; but I have a letter from one of the manufacturers in my State, who says, if this bill becomes a law, the whole business will have to be abandoned. The duty on the raw material is more burdensome in this case, because it constitutes a large share of the value of the manufactured product. I understand that the ivory constitutes seventeen-twentieths of the value of the manufactured articles. Ivory is also used for handles in the cutlery business and various other articles. The manufactures of ivory in Connecticut amount to something towards half a million of dollars. If the manufacture of ivory is destroyed, the duty on the raw material will be lost. But let it not be supposed there will be no revenue received if ivory is admitted free. The hands employed in its manufacture consume dutiable imports, from which the treasury receives a revenue; besides, the manufactured articles exported are exchanged for products, which go to increase your imports

and your revenue. It is a short-sighted and unstatesmanlike view of a question like this, to suppose that there is a loss of revenue to admit a raw material free of duty.

The next article to which I will call the attention of the Senate is raw silk, which the bill taxes 15 per cent., and fixes a duty of 30 per cent. on sewing silk and twist. In England, and I presume in Italy, raw silk is imported from China free of duty. The present duty on raw silk is fifty cents per pound, and on sewing silk and twist two dollars per pound. There will be a reduction of the duty on sewing silk of about 40 per cent.; and as this is a new business, and can now barely sustain itself, I fear it cannot survive if this bill succeeds. The product already amounts to half a million of dollars, and is fast increasing. Why should you discourage, and perhaps destroy, an infant manufacture? If the manufacture fails, the importation of raw silk ceases, and you lose all revenue. It is an interest, in one respect, having peculiar claims to favor, as the business is carried on mainly by the labor of females; and it should be the enlightened policy of every country to enlarge the circle of female industry in those departments of labor suitable for it. We know what the silk manufacture has done for France; and who can say, with proper encouragement, to what importance it may attain in the United States? This manufacture commenced in my State, and is still mainly carried on there.

By this bill, hats made of wool are subject to a duty of 30 per cent., and hat bodies of wool the same, while the duty on wool is 30 per cent., and hats are mainly made of foreign wool, as our wool does not nap well. Here is no discrimination for the American manufacture of hats. But this is not all. Fur is a part of the stock, the duty on which is to be assessed as follows: Furs dressed on the skin, 20 per cent.; furs, hatter's, dressed or undressed, not on the skin, 15 per cent.; furs, undressed, when on the skin, 15 per cent. Dressed or cut furs are at the same rate of duty as undressed furs on the skin. This will of course encourage the importation of dressed or cut furs, to the exclusion of undressed furs on the skin, and destroy the business of cutting furs, which has recently commenced in this country. This, in all its branches, is also an important business with my constituents; and I can state a case which will exemplify the operation of your laws. Previous to 1842, the duty on foreign wool was greater than on hat bodies; and a hat manufacturer of Danbury, Connecticut, who manufactured hat bodies by machinery, removed his business to Denmark, to make hat bodies to be sent to this country; but the tariff of 1842 imposed a duty of eighteen cents on wool hats and hat bodies, which destroyed his business, and he returned to the United States, and established the business in the town where he formerly resided. This bill imposes more duty on the raw material than on the manufactured article, offering an inducement for this manufacturer again to return to Europe to pursue his trade of making hats and hat bodies for the American market. Such is the effect of laws discriminating against the mechanical industry of the country. The gentleman alluded to is now engaged in cutting hatter's furs, which this bill protects by a duty of

20 and 15 per cent. on fur on the skin, and 15 per cent. on cut furs, being 5 per cent. against the American manufacturer. Under the present law, three-fourths of the furs used in this country are imported dressed and cut; and should this bill pass, cutting furs here must be abandoned, and the labor transferred to Germany, where the cutting of furs is carried on extensively.

Type metal and old type are at the same rate of duty as types and stereotype plates, which must greatly injure the making of types and stereotype plates in this country.

I will now call the attention of the Senate to linseed, and the manufacture of it into linseed oil. Flaxseed is taxed 20 per cent. in one schedule, and linseed, which is the same thing, at 15 per cent. in another: which rate of duty will be collected? Hempseed and rapeseed are also 15 per cent.: and linseed oil is subject to a duty of 20 per cent. Here is the same duty on flaxseed and the oil made from it. Should this bill become a law, the manufacture must be abandoned, and foreign oil take the place of American. This is an important interest, not only as to the manufacture of the oil, but as to the trade and navigation connected with it.

There are single establishments employing three hundred men. The whole product in the country is very large. Ninety per cent. of the flaxseed raised in this country is purchased for manufacture, so that the farmer must lose his home market, and a reduction in the value of his seed. The trade in exporting oil-cake, and importing linseed, must also cease. This trade is very extensive, employing 17,000 tons of American shipping to Calcutta, the Baltic, and the Mediterranean. Linseed, if I am not mistaken, is imported free in England; which will enable the British manufacturer to monopolize the American market, to the ruin of this interest in all its parts in the United States. Ten years ago there was not a bag of linseed imported from the East Indies; and in 1845, there was imported from Calcutta alone 88,322 bags, equal to nearly 9,000 tons. By the present law, linseed pays a duty of 5 per cent., and linseed oil 25 cents per gallon; by this bill the duty on the raw material is raised from 5 to 20 per cent., and at least 50 per cent. of the duty on oil taken off. The present duty is high, yet the increased competition has reduced the price from one dollar or more per gallon, to from sixty to seventy-five cents per gallon. Why should this interest—manufacturing, commercial, and agricultural—be recklessly destroyed? Who is benefited by it? No one but the British manufacturer and shipowner. Is not this, then, a British bill?

I pass on to another important interest which is protected in the same manner. I allude to raw copper, and the manufactures of copper. This is also both a commercial and manufacturing interest.

By the bill, copper in pigs and bars is subject to a duty of 5 per cent.; old copper, fit only to be manufactured, 5 per cent.; and copper sheathing is free. By the present law copper is a free article, and also copper sheathing, in aid of navigation.

By a memorial now before Congress, it appears that there is about thirteen millions of pounds of copper used in the United States annually. It is obtained from—

Chili, in pigs.....	lbs. 6,500,000
England, in sheets.....	3,500,000
England, in cakes.....	1,000,000
Mines in the United States.....	500,000
Old copper from various sources....	1,500,000

In all.....lbs. 13,000,000

From this it appears that England supplies us in refined copper and copper sheathing, with more than one-fourth of all the copper consumed in the United States. The trade between the United States and the west coast of South America, Chili, Bolivia, and Peru, is of the annual value of about \$1,500,000. The principal articles of export are domestic cottons, of which 12,000,000 of yards are sent annually, constituting more than half of our entire exports to those countries, for which raw copper is received in return; so that we exchange about 12,000,000 yards of cotton cloth for 6 or 7,000,000 pounds of copper. We have sustained a competition in those countries with the British in exporting our cottons, because we have taken copper in return, whilst they receive the precious metals. The 5 per cent. duty on the raw copper, when we admit copper sheathing free, will be a bounty to the British manufacturer, to enable him to undersell in our own market the American manufacturer, the effect of which will be to destroy the whole interest, commercial and manufacturing. The petitioners say truly, "this is a bounty to foreigners, and a tax upon ourselves. What would be said of the policy of England were she to tax raw cotton and admit cotton manufactures free?"

Here we see some of the beauties of the free-trade doctrines of this bill. Who can doubt that this is the "great measure of the age?" Charity is no longer to begin at home, but among foreigners; and all who do not believe in these practical principles of free trade, are a benighted set, and behind the intelligence of the day!

I might go on, Mr. President, and refer to numerous other articles and interests which receive the same sort of protection, the same fostering care as those which I have noticed. Brass in pigs and bars, and old brass, tin in pigs and bars or sheets, old pewter and zinc, all raw materials, are to be taxed five per cent., most of which have been heretofore free. Tin in sheets was always free, previous to the act of 1842, which put a nominal duty of 2½ per cent. upon it. It is now to be increased to five. It is the raw material for making vessels and wares in common use by all our citizens. Dye stuffs of all kinds are to be taxed. Peruvian bark, from which quinine is produced, and crude brimstone, the raw article for chemical preparations, for the manufacture of gunpowder, and other purposes, are all to be taxed, whilst sulphuric acid, manufactured from it, is at a lower rate of duty. Why is all this? Is it intended to discourage and depress our ordinary mechanics and artisans? Is it feared that they are making too much money? Is the object to obtain revenue? What short-sighted, unstatesmanlike policy! Is it not apparent that much more revenue would be received from the consumption of other dutiable articles, by those engaged in work-

ing up these raw materials? Besides, many of them in a manufactured state are sent abroad, and swell your imports. This bill is a striking example of the blind leading the blind. I forbear to go further into its details. I have examined enough of them, to show the total want of all incidental protection; of a reckless disregard of domestic productions and labor; of a wanton abandonment of the rights of those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, and of the interests of all classes.

I now beg to call the attention of the Senate to a more general and important consideration—to the *general policy* of this measure. And here, sir, we are not left to conjecture or speculation. However reckless this bill may be in its principles, or confused and contradictory it may be in its details, it has not been framed without a purpose. It is designed to effect certain important results. And the Secretary has informed us what these results are. It is intended to check and diminish the mechanical and manufacturing industry of the country, to restrain the internal trade or exchanges, and to stimulate and enlarge our foreign commerce. It is to increase our imports, in the expectation of augmenting the demand in foreign countries for our staple exports, particularly cotton and tobacco. It is estimated that the low duties on foreign fabrics will increase their importation to the amount of \$15,000,000. And how is this to be accomplished? A reduction of the duties on manufactured articles will not sensibly increase the amount consumed in the country. But if the foreign manufacturer can undersell in our market the American manufacturer, then foreign manufactures will be introduced, to the exclusion of American productions. It is in this way, and in this only, that importations can be increased to any extent. And here we see that of the fifteen millions expected increase of importations, nearly four-and-a-half millions are to be cotton goods, about one million two hundred thousand are iron, one million one hundred thousand are woollens, eight hundred thousand are to be salt, and most of the rest are manufactured articles. The policy of this "great measure of the age," then, is to curtail home productions, in the hope to increase the amount and value of the exports of the planting States. The plan is to increase our exports of the products of the soil, by first increasing our imports. This is reversing the laws of trade. The imports of a country have generally been supposed to depend on its exports. If the exports are increased, this will swell the amount of the imports, as the latter are purchased by the former, and the profits of the freight upon them. If, from an excited state of trade, the imports are increased beyond the exports, this produces an unfavorable balance of trade and of exchange, both of which tend to check importations, and bring them down to the exports, and often below, as the balance of a previous year must be paid. This every one is familiar with, having the least knowledge of the subject. Hence it follows, that the imports of the country cannot permanently be augmented, but by an increase of its exports, as there is no other way of paying for them. A reduction of duties on particular articles of imports, which interfere with similar produc-

tions at home, may increase the amount imported; but if the exports are not increased, it will occasion a corresponding decrease of imports in other articles. The aggregate amount of imports can only be increased by the increase of the whole amount or value of exports. All, then, that can be effected by this policy is, to increase the imports which interfere with home productions, and to diminish the imports which do not interfere with our own productions. This, then, would be the result of the enlightened policy of this measure, so far as it can produce any change in the foreign trade of the country. You may increase the imports of cotton goods four or five millions of dollars, woollens one million, iron, one or two millions, and consequently diminish to the same amount, other imports. But the increase of the imports of these articles, will necessarily diminish the home productions, to a corresponding extent, as the consumption of the country will not be increased. On the contrary, it will be diminished, as the ability of the people to consume foreign imports will be impaired, unless the labor which would have been employed in the diminished manufacture, can be in some other way as profitably occupied. And in what way can it be employed? Shall we be told in agriculture? Would not increased production there, diminish the price, by excess, beyond the demand, perhaps equal to the whole increased labor? The result of this policy, then, is, to diminish, to the amount of fifteen millions, American productions, and the labor thus employed. The prosperity and wealth of the country are to be advanced by diminishing its labor, by substituting fifteen millions of the products of foreign labor, for the like amount of the products of American labor.

Surely this is a wise policy! And who is to be benefited by it? Why, it seems to be supposed that this increase of importations, will raise the value of our exports; that is, cotton and tobacco. But this by no means follows. If the price of cotton has been the highest in years of large importations, the increased imports was not the cause of the high price of that staple, but the high price of the cotton was the cause of the increase of importations, which were the proceeds of it. This measure, therefore, is an experiment, to try to increase the value in foreign markets of the staple exports of the country; and this experiment is to be made, by the sacrifice of fifteen millions of American productions, more than one half of which are wages of labor. Those home interests are to be sacrificed for a mere anticipated advantage to the cotton interest, and that entirely uncertain. The Secretary complains that the importations of protected articles have decreased, and the revenue declined, because the domestic production has taken their place in the consumption of the country. Well, is this an evil? Is it an evil even in respect to revenue? If these imports have decreased, have not other dutiable articles increased in proportion, as our entire imports have exceeded our exports?

The policy of this measure is, to check and curtail American productions in the arts and manufactures, and to stimulate and to increase the productions of the soil, and their value. It is an attempt to change the employment and industry

of the country, to divert labor from a more to a less profitable employment; for the Secretary says, in one of his numerous reports, that the profits of labor in manufacturing, has been twice as great as in agriculture. Is not this a strange way to increase the prosperity and wealth of a nation? It is an attempt to arrest the enterprise and progress of the age, to bring the country back to its primitive state, and confine its industry to the cultivation of the earth. We are all to become herdsmen or tillers of the earth. What can be more preposterous? what more inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the age? What is this policy, but an attempt to bring the country back to its colonial state, when its whole industry was employed in the cultivation of the soil, and its trade consisted in exporting the products of agriculture, for the manufactures of England? This is the policy of the cotton-growing States. They wish to exchange their staple for the manufactures of England; not only for their own consumption, but for the consumption of the middle and northern States. They wish to stop the manufactures of the North, to make the whole country dependant on British manufactures, to be purchased with their cotton and tobacco.

How can it, then, be said that this is merely a revenue bill? Is it not a bill intended to protect or favor the labor and products of the country? Certainly it is. It is a measure designed to favor the slave labor of the South, at the expense of the free labor of the North. Fifteen or twenty millions of the products of northern labor are to be sacrificed for the mere hope of benefiting the slave labor of the South.

Is it right to do this? Is it just to sacrifice the interests of one section of the Union to benefit those of another section, if it was certain such result was to follow? But as it is a mere experiment, as the benefit to one section is uncertain and the sacrifice to the other certain, how preposterous and reckless is the scheme. The justice of this policy is quite equal to its wisdom.

I have said, sir, that this is a measure to stimulate and increase imports, with the hope thereby to increase and benefit the staple exports. This is a new principle in political economy. Do the wealth and prosperity of a country depend on its imports? I had supposed the exports of a country were to be regarded as a proof of its prosperity. Are large imports the cause, or even an evidence, of national wealth and prosperity? Let the history of our own country answer. For several years after the close of the revolutionary war, the country was flooded with imports of British goods; and what was the consequence? Almost every dollar of specie was drained from the country; large debts were contracted in England, and the merchants and people were involved in debt for British goods, which they had no means to pay for; and universal embarrassment and distress pervaded the land. A similar period of prosperity was witnessed at the close of the last war with Great Britain, and from the same cause—large importations. In 1815 the imports were \$113,000,000; in 1816, \$147,000,000; in 1817, \$99,000,000; in 1818, \$121,000,000. In 1816 the duties were over \$36,000,000. These importations exceeded by from fifty to one hundred per cent.

both the wants of the country to consume and its ability to pay. And what was the consequence? An immense debt abroad, which drained all the specie from the country, broke the banks, and universal debt and embarrassment at home. Then followed a period of total stagnation of all business, and distress not equalled since the epoch following the close of the war of the Revolution. The whole energies of the nation were prostrated, as well as its resources exhausted and its currency destroyed. I remember that period well, and all its appalling evils. Grass grew in the streets of our cities, which exhibited the appearance of the pall of death being thrown over them. It was a purdysis upon the whole country, and the national pulse almost ceased to beat.

Let us test this new theory, that large importations, and importations the chief value of which consist in labor, produce national wealth, by looking at the commerce of the most prosperous, wealthy and powerful nations of the earth. Let us look first at England herself. Does her wealth come from large imports or large exports? Does she get rich by importing the labor of other nations, or by exporting the labor of her own citizens?

Here is a statement of her exports and imports for a period of ten years, from 1831 to 1840 inclusive:

Years.	Exports.	Imports.
1831.....	£72,429,004	£49,713,889
1832.....	76,071,591	44,585,741
1833.....	79,823,092	45,952,551
1834.....	85,393,585	49,362,811
1835.....	91,174,455	48,911,545
1836.....	97,621,558	57,023,862
1837.....	97,267,814	55,733,419
1838.....	85,535,538	53,224,874
1839.....	105,170,549	64,268,320
1840.....	110,198,716	62,004,000
Total.....	<u>£99,685,843</u>	<u>527,782,012</u>

The excess of exports over the imports in ten years, was £371,903,831. If this new theory is correct, that large imports produce national wealth, then Great Britain is being impoverished very fast.

Let us see what other nations import of the products of British labor.

In 1836, Great Britain exported to Russia, with sixty millions population, £1,742,434, being three pence for each person; to Sweden, with a population of three millions, £113,308, which is nine pence per person; to Denmark, having a population of two millions, £91,302, which is eleven pence per person; to Prussia, with a population of fourteen millions, £160,472, which is three-and-a-half pence per head; to France, with a population of thirty-two millions, £1,591,381, being eleven pence per head; to Portugal, with a population of three millions, £1,035,934, being one shilling and eight pence per head; to Spain, with fourteen millions population, £427,000. The whole exports to these seven principal nations in Europe, was only £5,211,839, possessing a population of one hundred and twenty-eight millions; whilst the British exports to the United States, then having a population of fourteen millions, were £12,425,605, being seventeen shillings sterling (nearly four

dollars) for every man, woman, and child, in the Union—our imports and consumption of British manufactures being more than twice the amount of all the great Powers of Europe. And yet it is thought necessary to endeavor to increase this amount. The British exports to her North American colonies, with one million five hundred thousand population, were £2,789,191, being £1 11s. 3d. per person; those to her West India Islands were £3,786,452, there being nine hundred thousand population, which is £3 12s. per person; those to British Australian colonies, having a population of one hundred thousand, were £1,180,000, being for each person £11 15s. If the importation and consumption of British manufactures is a source of prosperity, then her colonies are the most prosperous people in the world. And does not this comparative view of the exports of British goods to different countries explain her colonial policy? What is that policy, but to make her colonies dependent on her for all manufactured articles? Her colonial navigation laws secure this trade to her, and make her colonies dependent on her for manufactures of all kinds. And to compensate them in some measure for this, she has discriminating duties in favor of their productions, when exported to the mother country.

If by this new policy we can be made a little more dependent on Britain for manufactured articles, we may become almost as prosperous as her colonies.

Mr. President, this policy of attempting to restrict and confine the industry of this country to agriculture, and its trade to the exports of the raw productions of the soil, to be exchanged for foreign manufactures, is too preposterous to require the examination I have given to it. There is, however, one other consideration bearing on the question to which I must call attention; it is the testimony of history. Facts are stronger than arguments. Look at the nations of the earth. Where do you find the most intelligence, comfort, wealth, power, and general prosperity? Is it in those nations where labor is confined to the cultivation of the soil, or those where the arts have made the most progress? Compare England and France, with Spain, Poland, and Russia. Compare Belgium, Holland, and Germany, with Italy and Turkey. Compare the United States with the Spanish American republics in this hemisphere, where there are no manufactures, nor scarcely the rudest mechanic arts. Look over the page of history, and you see in ancient nations the same universal truth.

At this enlightened age, the avowed policy of this measure must fill every intelligent mind with astonishment—a policy which aims to arrest and curtail the industry of the country, in the arts and manufactures, and to divert it to the cultivation of the soil, where there is already an over-production.

Sir, I do not say that this measure will arrest and break down the mechanical and manufacturing pursuits and industry of this country. I only say that it is intended to do it to a certain extent, as it aims to introduce into the country fifteen, twenty, or thirty millions of the products of foreign labor, to take the place of the same amount of products

of American labor. How far it will accomplish this object—how far it may impair or destroy, in whole or in part, our mechanical and manufacturing interests—no one can say. What interests may sustain the blow, and what may sink under it, can only be known with certainty by a trial of the measure. That so sudden and great a reduction of duties will cripple, if not destroy, some of these interests, no one can doubt. If the object of the measure is accomplished, this must follow. If you introduce four or five millions of foreign cottons, the same amount now manufactured in the country must cease to be manufactured. One thing is certain: either these interests must be destroyed, or there must be a great reduction in the labor they employ. And, in either case, the blow must fall on the laboring classes. The large establishments, by reducing the wages of labor 25 or 33 per cent., may be able to go on. But the small establishments must generally be broken down. Why try an experiment to see how much reduction labor will bear. Is labor too high? Is it necessary to reduce it by legislation?

Sir, if the views I have taken of this measure are not entirely erroneous, it would be difficult, in looking back over the page of history, to find any act of recklessness or fatuity to compare with it. The one which appears to me to have the greatest analogy is the repeal of the Edict of Nantes. That, it is true, was not a revenue measure, nor dictated by any reference to the pursuits and interests of the people. It originated in the blindness of bigotry, which is always reckless of consequences. This measure has apparently originated in the infatuation of carrying out a theory, which is a different kind of blindness, equally reckless of consequences. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes—a repealing act like this—was a cruel and fatal blow at the mechanics and artisans of France, which were then in advance in the arts of any nation in Europe. They were hunted down, persecuted, and driven from their country. And what was the consequence? France was checked in its progress and prosperity, and did not recover from the shock in more than half a century. And these mechanics, artisans, and manufacturers, driven from their native country, fled to Belgium, Holland, and England, and in those countries planted the first seeds of their mechanical and manufacturing industry, which rendered them the successful rivals of France. This measure is calculated, and apparently intended, to be a blow at the same interests and the same class of men in this country; and should it be a permanent policy, (but this is impossible,) it might be productive of similar consequences here. One of two things would follow: our artisans and manufacturers must either abandon their pursuits, or emigrate to other countries to carry them on, where their interests would be better protected and taken care of.

Sir, with the views I entertain of it, I cannot but regard this bill as one of pains and penalties—as a measure of confiscation, recklessly sacrificing the rights of property and labor. A measure so extreme, producing so sudden and so great a change in the pursuits of the people, must necessarily involve great sacrifices, and, I fear, occasion much privation and distress. Let me state one case as

an example: An acquaintance of mine, a citizen of New York, long engaged as an importing merchant there, but formerly of my own State, is now in this city, and has informed me of the situation of his business. He is a manufacturer of sheet iron, some thirty miles up the Hudson. He has two hundred and eighty men in his employ, who, with their families, make a population of fourteen hundred souls. If this bill passes, he says he must suspend his business entirely. It may be thought this is said only for effect; but considering that this bill will reduce the duty on sheet iron, which is now largely imported from England, from fifty-six dollars per ton to thirteen dollars and a half, his statement can hardly be doubted. If his business is stopped, these two hundred and eighty laborers are thrown out of employment, and fourteen hundred persons deprived of their means of support. And where else can they find employment, when the same cause has produced the same result with other similar establishments, and when all other pursuits—if these men were fitted for them—are generally depressed? But this is not all. This iron manufacturer consumed two thousand five hundred tons of pig iron, and ten thousand tons of coal—the latter costing fifty thousand dollars. All engaged in making the pig iron—which comes from different places, some in New York, west of his establishment, some from Berkshire county, Massachusetts—must lose their business also; and the Pennsylvanians must lose the market for fifty thousand dollars worth of coal; and the persons engaged in freighting, transporting, and hauling those heavy articles, must lose their employment. The blow does not stop at the first interest stricken down, but passes on to others, farther than we can well trace it. What will be the direct loss of property to this manufacturer? what to others connected with his business? and what to the laborers in his employ? If these results are to follow, is it doing injustice to this measure to call it a bill of pains and penalties, and an act of confiscation?

There is one topic more, to which I will call attention. It seems to be supposed by some, that this measure is in harmony with the policy of Sir Robert Peel. Never was there a greater mistake. Sir Robert Peel has not abandoned the protective policy, much less is his policy hostile to the manufacturing interests. On the contrary, it is intended for their benefit and advantage. He has proceeded slowly and cautiously in reducing duties, acting on each case according to the condition of the business. He has reduced the duties on manufactures of cotton and on other manufactures; but has at the same time made raw cotton and all other raw materials free. This was a benefit to the agricultural interest, and all consumers, without injury to the manufacturer; removing the duty from the raw material, cheapened its production, and the loss of the duty on the manufactured article was of little consequence, as the British manufacturer makes his goods for other markets, and does not fear competition at home.

But he has abolished the corn laws, the great free-trade measure. Well, is that removing protection from the manufacturers? Not at all: it is giving them protection; it is cheapening one of

their raw materials, or one of the elements of expense in manufactured products. The corn laws were a protection to the landed interest, and benefited only the large landholders. They have been removed, because they were an unjust and odious tax on food, on consumption, and on the bread of life. They were removed, because the people were clamorous, and would not bear the tax on their stomachs any longer. And this is heralded as a great free-trade measure, because the people are permitted to have bread without being taxed for it. This was an oppressive and odious tax, and should have been abolished, from every consideration of humanity and sound policy, without any regard to the doctrines of free trade.

But cheapening food is a benefit to the manufacturer, so that it is a measure favorable to that interest. Sir Robert Peel's policy has been a careful regard and vigilant watchfulness over all the departments of industry; there has been none too large for his comprehension, and none so small as to be beneath his care. His policy is to take care of all: the friends of this measure propose to take care of none, and yet profess to be imitating the policy of Sir Robert Peel. But a policy which would be suitable to England, might not be suitable for the United States. Her condition and ours are directly the reverse. England exports manufactures to all parts of the world; of course, if she can undersell other nations in other markets, she requires no protection for her home market. She imports raw materials, and some breadstuffs and food. The United States exports agricultural products, and imports manufactures; consequently, our manufacturers are exposed to foreign competition, and the British are not. It is entirely a mistake to suppose that the British have abandoned their protective policy; they have only reduced the rates of duties, but the protective principle is everywhere maintained where the interest is supposed to require it, except on corn or flour, and that is given up because it was a tax on food, which the people would not bear, and ought not to bear. Her discriminating duties in respect to her colonies, and in all other respects, are maintained as much as ever, but at lower rates. They have only reduced the scale of protection, not relinquished the principle. But this bill, as I have attempted to show, abandons the principle, and goes on the ground that revenue laws should have no reference whatever to the interests of the country. This is the avowed doctrine of this great measure of the age; it is, nevertheless, true, that it has a reference to some interests, and is designed, as I have before said, to favor the planting interest, at the expense of the mechanical, manufacturing, and commercial interests.

It should not be forgotten by the American statesman, that the English are our rivals in all our interests except agriculture. We must, therefore, not lose sight of the relative condition and advantage of the British merchant and manufacturer, and the American merchant and manufacturer. And what has British legislation done for the English manufacturer? It has secured to him almost the exclusive enjoyment of the home market, and still more exclusively the possession of the markets of their colonies, containing a population of one hun-

dred millions, by their colonial commercial laws. In addition to this, it extends to him every possible facility and advantage in the markets of all other countries, by giving him access to raw materials on the cheapest terms, and by drawbacks on exports. This comprehensive policy, instead of being abandoned by Sir Robert Peel, has been rendered more complete and efficacious. By removing the duties from all raw materials which form an element in manufactured products, and cheapening their cost, and by taking off the tax on food, in connexion with their drawback system on exports, he has enabled the British manufacturer to compete with the manufacturers of this and other countries in their own markets. And what has our Government done for the American manufacturer? He has no colonial markets secured to him; he has no drawbacks on manufactured articles exported; and all the advantage he has over his British rival in our own market, is the duties adjusted on the revenue principle. With this he is satisfied. But it is now proposed to deprive him of this, and to encourage the British manufacturer, so as to enable him more successfully to compete with his American rival, in the markets of his own country. Such is the policy of this bill, and such is the protection afforded to American industry and enterprise.

Mr. President, another, and by no means the least important, objection to this bill is, the consideration that it will entirely fail as a revenue measure. It is not my purpose to go much into this question, as it was so fully examined, both as to its general results and its operation in regard to particular branches of imports, by the Senator from Maine, [Mr. EVANS;] and I could add nothing to the clearness and force of his views. I have made a calculation of the revenue, according to the present law, on the importations of 1845, and the same calculations to show what would be the revenue under this bill on the importations of that year. I have taken 30 per cent. as the average revenue in 1845, according to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, or which is a fraction more than his statement. I have called the average rate of duty of the present bill 23½ per cent., which is the highest point at which the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. Lewis] has estimated it, or any one else. Upon these principles I have calculated the revenue on the importations of 1845, according to the existing law, and also according to this bill; and as the first process brings out a result differing very little from the actual revenue received in 1845, it is pretty conclusive that the second process shows, with a good degree of certainty, what would be the revenue, should this bill pass, on the importations of 1845. These calculations prove one fact which has been in dispute, namely, that the amount of the drawback must be deducted from the gross revenue. This was asserted by the Senators from Maine and Massachusetts, but denied by the chairman of the Committee of Finance.

My calculation is as follows. All the items are taken from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury:

Imports of 1845.....\$117,254,564  
Exports of foreign articles..... 15,346,830

Imports remaining in the country.... 101,907,734

On which an average duty of 30 per cent. produces a gross revenue of.. \$30,572,630  
Deduct drawbacks.....\$1,782,295  
Deduct drawbacks on refined sugar..... 74,371  
Deduct drawbacks on distilled spirits..... 21,740  
Bounties..... 4,174  
Allowance to fishing vessels 259,849  
Expenses of collection.... 2,053,468

Total to be deducted..... 4,225,888

Net revenue received into the treasury \$26,346,732

This is three or four hundred thousand short of the actual net revenue of the year, which may have come from the tonnage duties and light money. The result, however, is so near the actual net revenue of the year as to show that there can be no erroneous principles in the calculation.

In addition to the deductions which I have made from the gross revenue, there were the following which were paid from the treasury, viz:

Debentures and other charges.....\$283,500  
Additional compensation to officers of the customs..... 168,380  
Duties refunded under protest..... 398,739

Total.....\$850,510

This sum, deducted from \$26,346,732, the net revenue, by my calculation, leaves \$25,496,222. If to this we add \$319,000 for tonnage duties and light money, we make the available revenue of 1845 only \$25,815,222, instead of twenty-six millions seven or eight hundred thousand, which actually went into the treasury.

I now go through the same process of calculation on the importations of 1845, computing the average revenue at 23½ per cent., the highest rate put upon this bill:

The importations of 1845, after deducting exportations of foreign imports, were.....\$101,907,734  
The average duty on that amount of imports, estimated at 23½ per cent., produces a gross revenue of..... 23,948,316  
Deduct drawbacks, expenses of collection, allowance to fishing vessels, &c., the same as under the present law, which amount to..... 4,225,888

Net revenue..... \$19,712,428

And from this, if the expenses and charges were the same as in 1845, there would be the further deduction, after the revenue went into the treasury, of the sum of \$550,000. A part of this may not accrue. We see, then, that the utmost net revenue that can accrue under this new system, on the large importations of 1845, is less than \$20,000,000 being about \$7,000,000 short of the revenue actually received under the present law. It is my deliberate judgment that this is a fair and liberal allowance, and that, if this bill becomes a law, the revenue will fall short of \$20,000,000, unless the importations are greatly increased. For in this calculation no allowance is made for frauds on the revenue, in consequence of the ad valorem principle



of assessment. That there will be frauds, to a considerable amount, cannot be doubted. And what is the prospect of increased importation? In the present condition of the country, I think it is very small. The importations of 1845 exceeded the exports and the freights by \$4,000,000, which had to be paid in specie. If the imports are increased, it must be by an increase of the exports, or by creating a foreign debt. Great expectations are indulged of an increase of exports from the repeal of the British corn laws. In my judgment, this expectation will prove a delusion. There may be considerable increase of the exports of Indian corn and meal, and possibly some of flour, but this will depend on the crop in England and the countries in the north of Europe. But supposing there should be an increase of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 in corn, wheat, flour, and provisions; how easily this may be balanced by a slight depreciation in the price of cotton or tobacco. As to an increase of importations by creating a foreign debt, that could not last more than one year, and in a single year it would break down your currency, and bring upon the country a dreadful commercial revulsion. A revenue acquired in that way would be, of all others, the most disastrous and oppressive. Well, sir, suppose you find under this new system a deficient revenue of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000: what is to be done? Will you raise the duties? That, according to the Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the Committee on Finance, will diminish the revenue; for they say low duties will produce more revenue than high duties! You must, then, reduce still lower, follow up the principle of your system, and see where it will land you. I forewarn gentlemen that this bill will derange and break down the finances of the Government. Are you to go on by loans: and without any provision to pay the interest, much less for their ultimate redemption? O, blindness to the future! Is the disturbance and derangement of the business of the country so great a good, that, to accomplish it, you will expose your revenue to a deficit of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000, to say nothing about the extraordinary demand made by the war? And to the extent that your revenue proves deficient have you taken away that protection which is incident to a mere revenue tariff.

I now, sir, dismiss this part of the subject, and will close with some remarks on the political aspect and bearing of this question. That it has a political aspect, and will have a political influence, cannot be doubted. Is this a Democratic measure? Is it based on the recognised principles of the Democratic party? I deny that it is. I enter my solemn disclaimer, and protest against the assumption, that this measure is, in its principles or purpose, in harmony with the doctrines of the Democratic party, old or new. It may be in conformity to the principles of a small minority of that party, sometimes called the Carolina school, but with no other. It is not in conformity to the principles of Jefferson, Madison, and the early Democrats; nor does it harmonize with the avowed principles of Crawford, Lowndes, Jackson, and Van Buren. The old Democrats were friendly to manufactures, and averse to keeping this country dependant on Britain for its supplies. They wished to make the

United States independent of Great Britain, while the Federalists of that day desired to keep the country dependant on England for all our goods, and ridiculed the idea of our manufacturing anything for ourselves. The Federal party then were the commercial party, and desired to keep the country dependant on England for its manufactures, so that they could enjoy its trade, consisting in exporting the products of the soil, to be exchanged for British manufactures. They were the advocates for the same policy which this bill is calculated and designed to favor. But the Federal party have since changed their opinions and become friendly to the manufacturing interest, owing mainly to the fact, that the capitalists of the eastern and middle States have invested much of their capital in it. But, because their opponents have changed, is no reason why the Democratic party should change their policy; nor have they done so. The Democratic party have at all times been as favorable to the policy of sustaining and protecting the domestic productions and industry, as their opponents; but have not believed it expedient to adopt such extreme measures to secure the object. The doctrines of free trade are of recent origin, and do not now prevail, except with a comparatively few individuals. In none of the middle or northern States are their numbers such as to make any sensible impression on public opinion. The free-trade doctrines of the Carolina school may have been spreading at the South; yet it is doubted whether a majority of the people have embraced them in many, even of the southern States. But so far as I know, the great body of the Democrats of the middle and northern States are friendly to the policy of sustaining and encouraging the mechanical and manufacturing interests, by a moderate and just discriminating system of revenue duties. They claim to be quite as friendly to these interests as their political opponents, and differ only as to the degree of protection which is required to sustain them. If this bill, then, contains the unqualified principles of free trade, and repudiates all protection, shall we not, in giving it our support, relinquish the principles we have always maintained? and perhaps without being aware of it, find ourselves placed on a ground where we cannot stand? Shall we not find ourselves occupying a position on this great question of domestic policy, hostile to the interests of our people? With these views, sir, to support this measure would, in my judgment, be to abandon the principles of my party. And yet we are called on to support this bill as a party measure. If it is the measure of the party, then the party has lost sight of its own principles and policy. Why, sir, are we not told by the central press here, that this measure rests on new principles? that it is a new theory put forth by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that none of his predecessors ever dared to recommend a system of revenue on free-trade principles, and favorable to the free-trade policy? This settles the question. This is a new measure—a new policy in this country. It is not a measure of the Democratic party, old or new. Its principles belong to the extreme portion of that party in the South. How, then, can it be supposed, that this measure can be approved by the Democratic party of the West, the Middle,

and the North? It is impossible: a measure in conflict with their long-cherished principles and hostile to their interests, cannot meet with favor. From the influence of the general expectation which prevailed, that the tariff of 1842 would be revised, those who have not carefully examined the principles and policy of this measure, have suffered themselves to fall into the fallacious opinion, that this is only a reasonable modification of the existing law; and availing yourselves of this consideration, and backed by the influence of the Administration, this measure may receive the sanction of Congress at this time; but it cannot be sustained.

Sir, it seems to be admitted that when the Democratic party is in power, its chief strength is in the South; and hence it is, that the South have assumed not only to direct its measures, but they seem determined to define and settle its principles. And this is a bold effort to palm upon the Democratic party of the Union, the extreme doctrines of the southern division of the party. We of the North are called on in the name of the party, not only to sacrifice the interests of our constituents, but to surrender what we have regarded as the principles of our party. Is it supposed that we can do this? Do our southern friends wish to overthrow and prostrate the northern Democracy? Do they think that they understand better than we do, the interests and opinions of our constituents? We have, on numerous occasions, been induced to go far, perhaps too far, in support of southern measures, to maintain the unity of our party, which has weakened us at home. But never before has the South presumed to make such an extravagant demand on our forbearance—on our known yielding dispositions for the general good. Why have not we been consulted in regard to this great measure, which so vitally affects our interests, and exerts so controlling an influence on northern politics? We should have been willing to sustain a measure originating in the spirit of compromise, a reasonable and just modification of the existing tariff; in which all sections should have yielded something of their extreme pretensions, and which should have afforded reasonable protection and security to the interests of all parts of the country. But this is a bill coming from the South—from the hands of two southern planters—either unacquainted with, or regardless of, northern interests, whether commercial or manufacturing, and affords no security to any of them. Our southern friends complain that they are oppressed by the act of 1842—a complaint which may have some truth in it, but is greatly exaggerated. And what do they propose as a remedy? Why, to pass an act fraught with tenfold the injustice to the productions, trade, and industry of the North. But this is not all; they have the modesty to call on northern men, in the name of the party, to assist in sacrificing the rights of their own people; to aid in checking their industry, arresting their enterprise, and in substituting the products of British labor in the place of the products of American labor. Nor is this all; for, at the same time, we are required to renounce our own principles, and accept in their stead the miserable free-trade abstractions of a section of the South.

Sir, is it not time to pause? Is it not time for

northern men, in Congress and out of it, to come to the conclusion, that the only safe and honorable course for them, is, to take care of their own interests and their own principles. The time may have been, when they were safe in the hands of our southern friends, but that time has gone past. The South is not now what it once was. In the early period of parties, Mr. Jefferson and the great men of the South were the defenders of the northern democracy, then struggling against powerful odds and dreadful prejudices at home. Southern republicans, under the guidance and direction of such enlightened and patriotic statesmen, were the defenders and protectors of the democracy of the North; and it was from this cause that we probably contracted the habit of constantly yielding to the South, and permitting them to give a direction to our national affairs. And this yielding disposition at the North has given rise to the most extravagant pretensions at the South. Whilst they admit that they are the weaker section of the Union, in numbers, in representation in both Houses of Congress, in wealth, in every way, still they have managed to have a controlling influence over the Government whenever the Democratic party has been in power; and this embraces all but eight years since 1800. The northern democracy have, during this long period, had but one northern President—a statesman of profound sagacity and wisdom—and yet so strong was the pressure of southern doctrines and pretensions, and such his disposition to yield what he could with propriety to them, that he exposed himself to the charge of being a “northern President with southern principles.” Well, what was the result of this yielding to the South, this disposition to please southern politicians, and to respect their peculiar abstractions? Why, sir, notwithstanding the spirit and disposition in the Administration, to which I have referred, a large portion of southern politicians were dissatisfied and complaining during the whole of Mr. Van Buren’s term. And what more? Why, the popular voice in all the States had designated him as the candidate for another term. But the South would not submit to this; and intrigued and plotted against the popular will, until, finally, by aid of the Texas question and the two-thirds rule, they succeeded in overruling the will of the majority and in defeating the northern candidate. Well, sir, I suppose they expect to go on in this way—with southern Presidents, and the South controlling the measures and policy of the Government, and taking the lion’s share of the Federal patronage. These things have been, and perhaps will continue.

One of the means by which the South has so long maintained an ascendancy, has been, the control, which she has always taken care to secure, of the central press at the capital. With a southern President, and a southern press, to direct and form public sentiment, is it to be wondered at that southern doctrines and southern influence have obtained an ascendancy, greatly exceeding the real merits of the one, or the intrinsic strength of the other? At all times has the press here, having the confidence of the Administration, been edited by southern men. At some periods there may have been no just cause of complaint—the press has been conducted with great ability, and done justice to all

sections; but, at others, the North has been almost entirely overlooked by the semi-official organ; and never was this grievance greater than at the present time.

We are a patient and forbearing people; we have borne these things and have not complained, and perhaps shall continue to do so: but you must not press us too hard against the wall; there is a point beyond which we cannot go. I think, sir, we have about reached that point. Let me say to my northern friends, that the time is coming, and now is, when we must take care of ourselves; when we must look after our own interests and our own principles. Whenever the South may think that they have had the Presidency long enough, and feel willing to yield to a northern candidate, I sincerely hope he will be careful not to expose himself even to the suspicion of being a "northern man with southern principles." We have a homely proverb at the North, that "every tub must stand on its own bottom;" and, in view of this and other measures, I am inclined to think that northern tubs with southern bottoms will not stand very steady hereafter.

Mr. President, I have now about concluded what I have to say on this subject. I have endeavored to discharge my duty, however painful it has been, to my constituents, to my party, and to the country. Sir, I stand here in defence of the rights of labor—of the free labor of the North. This, sir, is a great and sacred interest—the most important interest in this country. Here is my commission and my instructions, (taking up a volume containing the statistics of Connecticut;) I have sometimes disregarded the instructions of the Legislature, but these instructions come from a higher source, from the people themselves. Here, sir, is a record of the industry of my people, amounting to fifty millions; thirty-five of which are mechanical and manufacturing industry. This is the evidence of the interest my constituents have in this measure. It is a great interest—an interest that concerns almost every man, woman and child in the State. To him who has no other capital than his hands, it is his only interest. These interests, sir, I fear, are to be struck down or impaired by this bill. How dare you invade the rights of the laboring man? How dare you abstract from the pittance of him who earns his bread with the sweat of his brow? I beseech you, I admonish you not to do it. Do not rob the laboring man of his just reward. Do not, I conjure you, send alarm and dismay, if not distress and want, to the hearths of thousands of laboring poor. No, sir; they are not poor, as they earn a comfortable living. No; they are not poor, unless you make them so, by robbing them of their all—their employments. I have done what I could do to save them from this cruel blow. I have not hesitated as to my course. When this bill first made its appearance in the Senate, I raised a voice against it; that voice was heard, and inspired a hope, that the country might yet escape the threatened calamity. It proclaimed one truth, that all on this side of the Chamber would not give their support to this extraordinary measure, in obedience to the behests of party, and reckless of its effects upon the interests of their constituents. Seeing that one dared to stand up

against an external pressure, they had reason to hope that some others might follow the example. This induced those whose interests were menaced to come on here, to see if anything could be done to ward off the threatened blow. I have conversed with many of them, and heard their statements. They feel that their interests are endangered; that their business may be suspended and their property destroyed. They ask no favors, but only beseech you, not unjustly to break up their pursuits and confiscate their property. But neither their remonstrances nor my exertions will, I fear, avail anything. If I thought they would; if I could believe that my efforts would be instrumental in defeating this measure, I should feel that my public life had not been wholly unproductive of benefit to the country. To arrest so great an evil; to stop a measure supported by no necessity, no reason, and yet fraught with the most alarming consequences, I should regard as a service to the country, which I never expected to have it in my power to render.

But I fear I have no such power; that this measure is to be consummated, and all its train of evils brought upon the country. But how is this bill to pass? Is it not to become a law, if at all, against the judgment of a majority of the Senate? Such, sir, will be the case. I cannot be mistaken on this point. And is not this a serious fact, that a measure so deeply, so vitally affecting the interests of the whole people, should be adopted, against the judgments of a majority of the Senate, the representatives of the States? And I think I may say the same of the House of Representatives: so far as I can learn, a majority of the Representatives of the people have not in their consciences approved of this bill, although they have, by some strange influence, given it their votes. What moral force can it be expected such a law will have with the people? An act which is to pass, against the judgments of a majority of both Houses of Congress! Well, sir, I have done what I could to prevent this result. What more can I say, or to whom can I appeal to come to the rescue? Can I appeal to my northern friends? I have attempted to convince them that this measure is wrong—wrong every way; that it is hostile to the interests of their constituents, as well as mine; that it is a departure from the principles of the Democratic party, and that it cannot fail of being productive of great evil. If I have not convinced them of these truths, it is not in my power to do it; and what more can I say? If a regard to the interests of their constituents and the principles of northern Democracy will not prevail with them, or if in their opinion the support of this bill is not inconsistent with either, I hardly know on what other ground I can appeal to them for their cooperation. Shall I allude to the influence of this measure on the party in power, which takes the responsibility of its adoption? Sir, I have great fears that that influence will be disastrous, if not fatal. The influence of this measure will come home to men's "business and bosoms," and cannot be resisted. If you strike a blow at the pursuits and employments of the people, they will defend themselves as well as they can; and, if necessary, they will strike back. If you take the

"bread from the mouth of labor," you need not expect to find the sufferer in very good humor with those whom he will be told are the authors of the evil. Sir, embarrassment, difficulty, stoppage of business, debts, and distress, will follow this measure in a greater or less degree. The people will feel its blighting influence; the business man will feel it; the laboring man will feel it; all will feel it; and when the people feel, they will think and act. Sir, I see difficulties enough to appal the stoutest hearts. I see breakers ahead, and greatly fear that the pilots who are conducting the ship of State will not steer her clear of them. But if so, I shall have the consolation that I foresaw the danger; that in time I raised a warning voice, which was not heeded; and if the noble ship shall be foundered upon the rocks, I shall not desert her; I will remain, and go down with the rest. This is my last appeal. Will you not try to save the old Democratic ship, when there is reason to fear she is in great danger? Before it is too late, I appeal to you to save the ship.

Under other circumstances, I could appeal with confidence to some of my southern friends; I could appeal to my friend near me, [Mr. BACRY.] or to the friend who usually occupies that seat, (pointing to the seat of Mr. Haywood.) I could appeal to their sense of justice and magnanimity, not to force upon my constituents a measure so unjust and oppressive; and I am sure I should not appeal in vain. But how can I appeal to my friends from the South to save my constituents from a measure, however unjust and oppressive, when my northern friends, whose constituents have interests similar to mine, are coöperating to consummate the work of ruin? I see, then, no one to whom I can appeal with any hope of success. Still, sir, I will not despair; I will continue to hope, until the deed is done, that this bill will fail, and that in some way the country will escape the evils which must follow its passage. With my thanks to the Senate for their patience and attention, I have only to say that I have done.

# REMARKS OF MR. NILES.

DELIVERED

IN THE SENATE, TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1846,

*On the motion to postpone the further consideration of the Tariff Bill until the first Monday in December next.*

Mr. NILES moved that the further consideration of the subject be postponed until the first Monday in December next.

[Mr. COLVITT questioned the propriety of this motion. He thought that it was out of order; the bill had been ordered to a third reading, and there was, therefore, another question pending.]

Here the calls for the third reading of the bill were renewed.

Mr. MANCINI, and others: It is objected to, and therefore must lie over.

The point of order not having been disposed of,

Mr. SIMMONS contended that the motion by the Senator from Connecticut was in order. The question would be, first, upon the postponing the further consideration; and, if that was rejected, then any further action would be in order; but while a motion to postpone was pending, no other action would be in order.

The objection was here withdrawn.]

Mr. NILES proceeded to say that he hoped gentlemen would not be impatient; they would have soon enough of both the credit and responsibility of this measure. It was not his purpose to delay the final vote, much less to harass and vex the Senate; he was not in the habit of that on any occasion, and certainly he would not resort to such expedients on one so solemn as this. He could not consider that he had done his whole duty in opposing this extraordinary measure, without making this, the last effort, to arrest its progress. Circumstances had thrown upon him a grave and highly responsible duty in regard to this measure, and he had never for a moment hesitated in meeting it, or faltered in its discharge, however painful it had been. He had fearlessly met this bill on its first appearance in the Senate, and had done all that he believed it his duty to do to defeat it, by attempting to show that it was such a bill as ought not to receive the sanction of this body. Having no longer any hopes of succeeding in this, it now only remained for him, as a last effort, to attempt to get it postponed. His object was to give his northern friends an opportunity to arrest or postpone this measure without a direct vote on its merits. He would, therefore, in the most friendly but solemn manner, make this last appeal; he would earnestly beseech them to pause,

and delay the final action on this bill, so deeply interesting to their constituents as well as to his.

He had said some days since, when addressing the Senate, that he could not appeal to any of his northern friends to vote against this bill, because the interests of their constituents were substantially the same as his; and if what was due to them and their interests could not prevail, he could not suppose any respect for the rights of his constituents, or any considerations of regard for himself personally, could influence their action. But now he did not appeal to them in regard to the merits of the bill; he asked only for delay. He asked that the final decision might be put off, and that the question might go before their constituents and his, that they may examine it, and decide upon its merits. If this is allowed, it will be thoroughly discussed in its principles and its details, and its probable influence be judged of on their interests, pursuits, and employments. He sincerely hoped that this reasonable request would be accorded to him. He asked it for their constituents as well as his own. He asked it for the whole people of the North, most deeply interested in this question. What a solemn spectacle, (said Mr. N.) does this Senate now exhibit. We are about to decide a grave question, more deeply affecting the interests, the business, and employments of the whole people of the middle and northern States than any which has for years, if, indeed, ever before, been submitted to the decision of Congress. And this great measure has come as a surprise upon the people. A few weeks since no one thought such a measure could have come under consideration at this time. But the moment the danger appeared, all became alarmed, and many have come on here to see if anything could be done to arrest it, and to escape so fatal a blow to their prosperity. Sir, they are now here, watching with a trembling anxiety the final issue of a measure fraught, as they honestly believe, with the most alarming consequences to their interests, and those of the whole people. They ask no favors at your hands: they only desire that they may not be sacrificed by their own Government. And who, on the other hand, is here demanding this measure? What voice has come up from the people, or any portion of the people, demanding

this sacrifice? I have heard no such voice. Why, then, is this measure pressed on? Why, then, is this extraordinary act, unexampled in the legislation of any country, to be forced on a reluctant people? And how is this to be done? Is it to pass by the votes of a majority of the States? No, sir, it cannot so pass; there is not a majority of this body in its favor; it can only pass by your vote, not representing any State. Ought a measure like this to become a law without the sanction of a majority of the Senate? But this is not all; the Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. JARVIS,] stated yesterday that there was not one-third of the Senators who approved of this bill. Sir, I can endorse that statement; I verily believe that there is less than one-third of this body who, in their consciences, can say they approve this bill. The same I think I may say is true of the other House. This bill, then, is to pass and become a law against the judgment of a majority of both Houses of Congress. What force is it supposed such a law can have? Will it not be still-born—without moral life, power, or energy? It will be respected in the courts and the custom-houses; but in what other sense will it be the law of the land? It will want that sanction, the public opinion of the country, without which, no law can have any moral force. Will it rest on that abiding foundation, the judgment of the nation, and that judgment not the result of speculative or partisan opinions, but springing from the condition of the country—from the pursuits, the interests, and the wants of the people? And is not this bill admitted by its supporters to be full of defects—defective in its principles, defective in its details, and in carrying out its own principles? And yet it has not been allowed to be amended, but is to pass with all its defects, inconsistencies, and incongruities—and to pass without being defended: without any reasons being given why it should pass; without a single argument in its favor, and without answering a single objection of the many which have been urged against it. And is it supposed that such legislation, upon such a subject, will stand the test of scrutiny and time?

But I wish now to call the attention of its friends to another consideration. It is admitted by nearly all, that this is not such a law as can stand or ought to stand. It is to be passed to be amended. The question, then, is this: will you pass this bill, to amend it, or permit the present law to remain, and amend that? Which, then, is the proper course for statesmen and honest legislators to pursue? Do you say that this is a less objectionable law than the act of 1842? If this was admitted, which I do not admit, it does not settle the question I have submitted. The act of 1842, if a bad law, has been in operation three or four years, and its evils, if evils have attended it, are gone by: the business of the country has become adapted to it, and is now settled and quiet. Why, then, not let the law remain until you can amend it, or supersede it by a suitable and proper law adapted to the condition of the country, the wants of the country, and the opinions of the people? Why disturb the business and pursuits of the people? Why unnecessarily agitate and alarm the country? Why do this to get a mere temporary measure, which you admit you must either repeal or amend? It seems

that to-day we have called out an advocate for the defence of this measure in the honorable Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. McDERMOTT,] and from him we have at least one reason for the passage of this bill. I have again and again asked for the reasons for passing this bill at this time, and could get no response, no reason. We now have one, and what is it? Why, to curtail the profits of the large and wealthy manufacturers. But, sir, the fact is assumed; there is no evidence as to these large profits. But admitting it to be so, will not competition correct the evil? Will it not bring down these enormous profits? With an enterprising people like ours, will there not be enough to rush into any business which affords enormous profits? But is not this something new? Is it not a strange reason? Can any example be found in the history of the world of a Legislature passing laws to arrest the prosperity of the country, or to reduce the profits of any particular class of citizens in a pursuit open to all? Certainly, sir, this must be the great measure of the age, when we consider the great good it is to effect; when it is to stop individuals from getting rich too fast, and to check the prosperity of the country. The Senator says it will not affect the laborers, the mechanics, nor the small manufacturers. How does he know this? I tell him he is mistaken: these are the very men on whom this blow will fall. You may diminish the profits of the large establishments same, but you cannot crush them; they can stand, by warding off the blow, and transferring the sacrifice to others. They have hundreds, and some, thousands, of laborers in their employ, and they will save themselves by reducing the wages of those who earn their bread with the labor of their hands. And will you rob them of that bread, or diminish the amount? You can deprive labor of its reward, but you cannot so easily take away the income of capital. In such a struggle, capital has an advantage over labor. The blow, then, falls directly on the laborers. But how is it with the mechanics and small manufacturers—those who do their own work, and perhaps employ a few apprentices? They must sustain the sacrifice themselves. They will not be able to sustain a competition with the large establishments. But why is this experiment to be tried—an experiment to see how much reduction labor will bear? Is it to carry out a theory? Is it to test the cold, heartless, miserable theory of free trade?—a theory which no nation on earth ever put in practice—a theory which must ever remain a mere theory; which is fit only for speculative minds and the closet—wholly unworthy of statesmen or enlightened legislators. Mr. President, the attempt to pass this bill, and by way of a surprise upon the country, will bring up this great question of domestic policy in a way to agitate the whole country, and the agitation will not cease until it is settled on a basis consistent with the condition, the interests, and the business of the country, and the wants and opinions of the people. This, sir, will truly be the great question of the age—a question as to the basis on which the business and the industry of the people of this great country are to repose. This great question has been at rest for some years: it is now brought up,

by a conflict between extreme principles on one hand, and what are held to be extreme on the other. The interests to be affected by it now are vastly greater than at any time heretofore. Let me say to the honorable Senator from South Carolina, (turning to Mr. Calhoun,) that in the contest which he has now to meet on this great question, it will be presented under very different circumstances from what it was in 1832 when it seemed to threaten the stability of the Union. The interests now at stake are, compared with what they were then, as two or three to one; they are augmented two or three hundred per cent., and they are no longer confined to one or two sections of the country; they have extended to the South and the West, and are daily increasing and taking deep root in those quarters. They are also blended with all other interests—commerce, navigation, and agriculture. All the great interests of the country are now banded together, and if you strike a blow at one—if you break one link, the whole fabric of national industry may not fall, but it will feel, most sensibly feel, the shock.

Yes, sir, this great question of domestic policy, on which the prosperity and greatness of the country so essentially depend, must now be settled

There can be no peace, no quiet, until it is put at rest; and it will now be settled for the last time, so far as its principles are concerned. It is brought before the country in such a manner as to arouse the attention of the whole people, and to call forth all their energies. And it will not be a conflict of opinions only; there are so many, and so important interests involved, so many dependant upon it for their daily employment and daily subsistence, that it cannot fail to awaken the deepest and most embittered feelings. Mr. President, I have now discharged my last duty in relation to this measure, which I suppose is to pass. My appeal to my northern friends will not, I fear, be heeded. I am aware that they have gone far with it, too far. I am afraid, to stop short of its final consummation at this time. A delay of a few months is too much, I suppose, to hope for. If so, I have only to say to the Samsons, who are prepared to complete this work, come forward with your locks unshorn, seize upon the pillars of the nation's prosperity, and overthrow the mighty fabric. But I must be permitted to add, in the spirit of friendly warning—*be careful that you are not yourselves crushed in the common ruin*

